

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/775,207	02/11/2004	Michael J. Hubbard	OMNO-0003-1	9961	
75	590 05/24/2006		EXAM	INER	
David G. Burleson			ZIRKER, DANIEL R		
Chief Intellectu	al Property Counsel				
OMNOVA Solutions, Inc.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
175 Ghent Road			1771		
Fairlawn, OH 44333					

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/775,207	HUBBARD, MICHAEL J.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Daniel Zirker	1771		

	Daniel Zirker	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set fortheter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70		E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriation in the final Office of the final Off	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the con	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); educing or simplifying	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ol>			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	•	•	•
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	_] will not be entered, or b) ⊠ wi rided below or appended.	II be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	before or on the date of filing a N I sufficient reasons why the affidate	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)	
$\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}$	aniel Zuken	Daniel Zirker Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1771	

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 112, 2nd para. rejection of claim 12 set forth in Para. No.2, lines 16-17 of the Final Rejection stating that "first membrane" should be -second membrane-.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner believes that certain observations are necessary in light of applicant's After Final Response. As regards the contention that the Action provides "no grounds in support of" his 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejection it is noted that applicant appears to have essentially ignored the great majority of the lengthy analysis presented by the Examiner. It is,e.g. noted that in closely related SN 10/775,206 applicant had no problem changing "a membrane comprising a thermoplastic" to -thermoplastic membrane-, but the Examiner's same request has here been met (Response, page 6) with a blunt traversal. With respect to applicant's contention (Response, paragraph bridging pages 6-7) that the Examiner has rejected the claims "based on facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner" and therefore he is requesting an Affidavit/Declaration under 37 CFR 104(d)(2) in support of these alleged allegations the Examiner can only note that after carefully reviewing the two earlier prior art rejection paragraphs of record based on the Venable references he can only state that he has simply no idea of what personal knowledge applicant is referring to. Finally, with respect to applicant's contention (Response, page 9, bottom paragraph) that "the Final Action, just like the Non-Final Action, fails to provide the applicant with any specific text that supports the Examiner's allegations" it must respectfully be noted that both the Nonfinal Action (Paragraph No. 8, lines 3-5) and the Final Rejection (Paragraph No.3, lines 9-11, lines 15-16) cite sections of each of the references as supporting evidence for his positions of record.